

App. No. 09/942,360

Amendment A

Page 8

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 17 and 24 were previously canceled. Claims 5-6, 18 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 12, 19, 22 and 25 have been amended. Nineteen claims are pending in the application: Claims 1-4 7-16, 19-20, 22-23, and 25.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6-8 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In order to move the present application to allowance independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 6 and any intervening claims. Similarly, claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 21 and any intervening claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant has also amended claim 22 such that it contains similar limitations to the limitations of claim 21 that the Examiner indicated as allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the independent claims include subject matter which the Examiner has indicated as allowable.

App. No. 09/942,360

Amendment A

Page 9

**Examiner Interview Summary**

2. Per 37 C.F.R. § 133(b), the following is a brief summary of the Examiner interview conducted on December 14, 2005 via telephone between Martin R. Bader, Attorney of Record, and Examiner Erin M. File. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her time during the interview. Claim 3 was discussed in relation to the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In order to remove any ambiguity from claim 3, Applicant proposed amending claim 3 such as it has been amended by way of the present response. The Examiner agreed that this amendment would be sufficient to overcome the rejection. There were no exhibits shown or any demonstrations conducted.

**35 U.S.C. § 112**

3. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claim 3 is unclear and is rendered vague and indefinite.

As stated above, claim 3 has been amended as discussed with the Examiner during the telephonic interview. Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 3 is made only for clarification purposes and is not a limiting amendment. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is overcome and that claim 3 is in condition for allowance.

App. No. 09/942,360  
Amendment A  
Page 10

35 U.S.C. § 102

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-13, 16, 18-20, 22-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,419 (*Freed*).

Claims 5, 6, 18 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and the limitations found therein have been amended into independent claims 1 and 12 in order to pursue the timely issuance of the subject matter the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Applicants submit the cancellation of claims 5, 6, 18 and 21 should not be viewed as the surrender of the subject matter of claims 5, 6, 18 and 21 or as a surrender of broader subject matter than any of the presently identified allowable claims.

Independent claim 22 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitation found in claim 21. Applicants submit that these amendments should place independent claim 22 in condition for allowance. Applicants note that *Freed* does not teach or suggest a system including both a "means for bypassing a filter and an amplifier in the front end if the received signal strength is greater than said first predetermined threshold" and a "means for bypassing a low noise amplifier if the received signal strength exceeds a second predetermined threshold that is higher than the first predetermined threshold," such as is recited in claim 22.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is overcome and requests a timely notice of allowance.

App. No. 09/942,360  
Amendment A  
Page 11

35 U.S.C. § 103

5. Claims 2, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,419 (*Freed*).

As stated above, all of the independent claims have been amended to include subject matter the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 14 and 15 are in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency upon an allowable independent claim.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is overcome and requests a timely notice of allowance.

App. No. 09/942,360  
Amendment A  
Page 12

C O N C L U S I O N

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited. Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas F. Lebans at (805) 781-2865 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin R. Bader  
Reg. No. 54,736

Dated: December 15, 2005

Address all correspondence to:

Thomas F. Lebans  
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY  
120 South LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600  
Chicago, IL 60603  
(858) 552-1311